International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Advancing Risk Management Practices in Industrial Projects: An Analysis of Safe Work Analysis and HIRA Matrix Frameworks

Meenu Sahu[1], Harsh Pandey[2], S. S. K Deepak[3]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Dr. C. V Raman University Bilaspur (C.G.), India meenusahu95@gmail.com
[2]Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Dr. C. V Raman University, Bilaspur (C.G.), India drharshpandey@gmail.com
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Bhilai Institute of Technology, Raipur (C.G.), India drsskdeepak.bit@gmail.com

ABSTRACT—

Industrial projects requiring high complexity operate mostly through effective risk management practices. Risk management techniques enable project completion while protecting workers from accidents along with improving operation output. This study evaluates hazard identification and risk assessment critical methodologies found in industrial settings through analysis of Safe Work Analysis (SWA) and the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) Matrix assessment instruments. Organizations can prevent potential risks with these tools which help create safer work areas and better safety regulation compliance. The research demonstrates how SWA supports risk reduction by involving workers and delivering continuous safety instruction even though the HIRA Matrix enables organizations to comply with occupational safety guidelines. This paper examines current frameworks to demonstrate effective risk management practices while analyzing methods for integrating these approaches into security cultures of organizations. The analysis enhances knowledge about frameworks for managing risk to result in enhanced operational outcomes together with enhanced safety measures.

Keywords—Hazard Identification And Risk Assessment Matrix, Safe Work Analysis, Theoretical Assessment Model.

1. Introduction

Industrial projects across sectors evolve fast which requires proper methods to manage potential risks that threaten safety performance and productivity together with project completion outcomes. Risk management stands as a fundamental operational procedure worldwide especially within industrial facilities which present complex high-scale operational conditions. The paper evaluates risk management approaches in industrial facilities by investigating identification methods for hazards alongside risk evaluation techniques and protective measures.

The critical element of sound risk management relies on the Safe Work Analysis (SWA) which methodically detects hazards that could surface from different work tasks and job phases. SWA provides risk minimization benefits to organizations and enhances work safety cultures through its approach of worker involvement in risk assessment procedures. Work commencement must wait until personnel evaluate all risk assessments which shows how proactive risk assessment guarantees safety standards while performing work. The SWA functions both as an initial base for continuous development through its safety method implementation in training disciplines to improve workplace operational excellence and worker participation.

The Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) Matrix operates as a parallel crucial instrument for conducting risk management tasks. The HIRA Matrix serves as a systematic method to recognize operations hazards and evaluate risks which supports OHSAS 18001:2007 safety compliance standards. The tool plays a fundamental role in managing complicated risks that appear in critical safety environments while helping businesses meet their health and safety requirements. Workers receive protection along with operational success through the necessary steps of risk identification followed by evaluation and mitigation made possible by the HIRA Matrix framework.

Risk management plays a vital role in industrial projects thus it becomes essential to use systematic risk identification approaches while building these tools into overall safety culture frameworks of organizations. Both theoretical and practical assessment models such as Theoretical Assessment Models (TAM) create a full-t Spectrum of risk management perspectives. These frameworks provide essential links between risk evaluation and safety-related solutions which produce useful applications to boost operational performance and protect workers from harm.

ARESS (IC-CIST 2025)

This paper examines essential concepts by evaluating scholarly materials while finding active practices in industrial implementations and their organizational use. The research examines the intricate attributes of controlling substantial industrial operations by analyzing how project intricacy together with stakeholder interaction dynamics affects risk administration results. The educational goal seeks to provide a complete understanding of risk management procedures which industry projects in multiple sectors can utilize to achieve high safety and operational effectiveness while reaching their targets.

2. Safe Work Analysis (SWA)

It is a method to identify the hazards that generate risks of potential accidents or illnesses related to each stage of a job or task and the development of controls that somehow eliminate or minimize the risks. Likewise, all work requires risk analysis and no work will be started without doing the safe work analysis.

The SWA must be reviewed by all those involved prior to carrying out the work, which can be suspended when the Safe Work Analysis was not done or the controls established in it are not met. The purpose of the job analysis is to identify the risks associated with each stage of the execution of a given job, which can potentially cause an incident and develop solutions for each risk that allow them to be eliminated or eliminated. According to Law No. 29783, Law on Safety and Health at Work.

A. Objectives of Safe Work Analysis (SWA)

- Analyze workplace hazards during work planning (review work conditions).
- Establish controls and/or preventive measures necessary for identified hazards.
- Motivate worker participation.
- Improve the safety culture at work.

B. Benefits of Safe Work Analysis (SWA)

- Allows the identification of previously undetected risks and increases knowledge of the job.
- Increases knowledge of safety and health, improves communication and promotes acceptance of safe work procedures.
- Once completed, it serves as a basis for developing many other safety training activities.

3. Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Matrix (HIRA Matrix)

Organizations use the HIRA Matrix effectively for hazard identification when examining professional accidents and health issues. The HIRA Matrix functions both as an essential hazard identification and risk assessment tool and an effective management system to help organizations carry out hazard identification and risk assessment following operational activities. The tool plays an essential role in health and safety standards compliance by following occupational health and safety regulations specifically OHSAS 18001:2007 requirements.

A. HIRA Objectives

- Training and educational programs use this process to make their arrangements.
- Planning of regulatory compliance becomes possible through this system.
- The tool provides valuable assistance for managing facility inspections at the organization.
- The system joins forces to conduct program strategy sessions while managing resource distribution.
- Risk control measure procedures become easier to establish thanks to this approach.

B. Importance of the HIRA Matrix

A HIRA matrix functions effectively when its recorded data remains accurate and reliable to offer organizational safety management a crucial enhancement tool. The implementation of the matrix requires several sequential elements for success.

- Each process requires verification of its established objectives as well as goals.
- Training the staff who work on these processes should be adequate and proper.
- The process requires methods which evaluate and measure all risks.
- The organization should foster awareness about risks throughout all its departments.
- Ensuring robust internal controls.
- The program requires process organization combined with criticality assessment for all processes.
- Defining responsibilities for each process and activity.
- The organization needs to evaluate how well the implemented risk reduction controls perform.

C. Regulations

- Law No. 29783, Law of Safety and Health at Work.
- D.S. No. 005-2012-TR, Occupational Health and Safety Regulations.
- OHSAS 18001:2007, Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series.

4. Literature Review

The literature review on risk and its management appears throughout this section. Any industrial project includes unavoidable risks yet these risks differ in dimensions across different projects.

Operations of specific industrial sectors experience high vulnerability to substantial risks due to their complex and large-scale nature which leads to extensive and multifaceted risks. The investigation emphasizes techniques that measure and handle these types of industrial dangers particularly in operations where high stakes are involved. Different research methods have studied risk evaluations according to their methodology to determine assessment criteria for evaluating risk severity in organizational operations [1].

The subsequent part of this section examines methods to handle the identified risks. A proactive risk management approach originates from planning the appropriate response measures first. The literature contains extensive research about risk response methods to reveal which factors guide appropriate response choices and teaches managers and team's effective implementation practices [2].

The examination takes into account both industrial sector operational complexity in general terms and detailed operational mosaic within distinct business domains. The discussion shows how operational complexity shapes both risk relationships and the process of risk response implementation [1].

Risk as a modern theoretical definition materialized recently even though people have long been aware of potential unintended losses. Risk originates from Latin and extends through French and Portuguese and German language background before it found its way into various other linguistic traditions according to the Oxford English Dictionary records. Risk has formal definitions in three areas according to the dictionary which establish its accepted meaning.

- Exposure creates potential harm and property damage as well as physical injuries (exposure-related aspect).
- The execution of a harmful task or procedure counts as a risk (hazard-related)

The nature of risk appears autonomously with every process and produces positive or adverse results based on the specific risk factors within the framework. The definition of risk in industrial environments focuses on future events together with their obtained results which remain uncertain. Risk contains "future events and outcomes' uncertainty" according to the authors of [3] through two fundamental evaluation factors that indicate probability of occurrence and severity of consequences. Risk assessment based on these two factors enables understanding of all possible outcomes from the event which may have negative or positive effects.

Assessing operational risk demands an understanding that it generates results that can be both beneficial and detrimental in nature. Risk behaves as an economic agent as indicated by the authors of [4] since risk management decisions determine whether financial loss or gain occurs. Additional research takes an unfavorable perspective to discuss exclusively how risks generate financial declines and operational interruptions [5]. The research will delve mainly into the adverse effects that risk events create.

The identification of particular risk events becomes essential for industrial project success as we apply risk principles to achieve organizational goals. Risk is a defined term by the authors of [6] as an event that has the potential to impact project goal accomplishment. Risk events extend beyond chance events since they substantively relate to the work objectives [7]. Project outcomes need effective risk management through the implementation of a complete risk framework to control their effects.

Risk management executes in four distinct phases starting from risk identification through risk assessment to risk response and finishing with risk control. Multiple investigations have studied these framework stages through extensive analysis to show that different industries need specific risk management approaches. Audits of both generic risk challenges alongside unique industrial threats which need specific management techniques exist according to the authors of [8]. Researches have introduced multiple assessment procedures to evaluate future risks through loss measurement techniques [1].

ARESS (IC-CIST 2025)

Different research studies present specific risk management actions within particular contexts beyond generic discussions of response strategies which include escalation, avoidance, transfer, mitigation and acceptance [9]. Recent academic studies on this topic are summarized in the subsequent sections about their treatments of each stage.

Risk Identification: At the beginning of risk management the identification and documentation of industrial operational potential events along with their risks forms one of the fundamental stages. Multiple techniques to detect industry-related risks have been analyzed by scholars who present specific strategies to identify risks within different industrial settings [10] [11] [12]. There exist several recognized approaches for identifying risks which are presented in the following list:

Brainstorming: Groups use brainstorming as a widely accepted approach for idea creativity during collaborative work. The authors of [10] indicates that group discussions under this system enable teams to detect main operational risks. The participants assemble concepts relating to possible project risks under facilitation leadership. While this process supports unrestricted idea-sharing it may produce non-relevant dangers among the generated risks. Facilitators maintain strategic importance because they guide risk assessment sessions to prioritize important risks among many possibilities.

Delphi Technique: The Delphi technique differs from brainstorming because it obtains expert opinions even though participants are not located together. These experts maintain independent work relations because initial contact between them does not exist. The facilitator organizes all risk evaluations provided by experts into one compilation that gets sent back for enhanced assessment from the entire group according to [12]. Tracking a standard number of repetitions leads this procedure to eventually reach total expert agreement about project risks.

PESTEL Analysis: Officials use PESTEL analysis to identify external risks that affect their project or organization. The PESTEL model includes political, economic and socio-cultural, technological as well as environmental and legal components. The evaluation of six general classifications helps experts establish a thorough assessment of external risks for projects and industries [1]. The identification of external threats affecting stakeholders begins with this evaluation method because these risks emerge directly or indirectly within the external environment.

Content Analysis: Content analysis provides a method according summarize different written materials and media for locating recurring themes and risks. The method organizes content information through the detection of particular thematic patterns. The method allows professionals to evaluate industry risks through the study of media reports and stakeholder interviews and industrial publications regarding risk management strategies. The method proves useful for industrial risk identification because it helps understand potential dangers which exist within manufacturing and technology production environments [13].

Expert Ideas: The identification of potential risks becomes essential by expert opinions specifically in fields lacking sufficient published risk management knowledge. Expert insights from steel manufacturing operations assist in finding risks which specific steel industry operations face but may be under-documented. Professional insights from interviews and direct consultations with field experts serve as a main source to collect this information [14].

The research adopted a consolidated strategy from established methods to detect external and internal risks within complex manufacturing industries.

Risk Assessment: After risks rise to the surface, they require assessment through which teams determine how much influence they will have on the project or organization. Risk assessment exists in two variants between qualitative and quantitative analysis based on the precision needs for decision-making [11].

Qualitative Risk Assessment: This method proves most useful for determining priority risk levels along with selecting the optimal response. Evaluation of risk likelihood and severity allows project managers and decision-makers through this method to establish the order of risk management [15]. According to the authors of [10] qualitative risk assessment provides adequate data to decide if additional investigation or prompt action should occur regarding specific risks.

Quantitative Risk Assessment: The detailed aspect of it includes specific risk measurement procedures. Projects need this method to calculate exact data points particularly when determining budget reserves and scheduled impact requirements to protect against risks [16]. The analysis of quantitative data provides detailed comprehension of risk-induced financial damage and operational disruptions that help organizations distribute necessary funds and create backup strategies.

Probabilistic Evaluation Combined with Impact Evaluation Makes up Risk Assessment: Assessing risks remains vital for industrial organizations that must handle possible security threats. According to [16], risk event severity evaluations require analysis of two fundamental elements including the probability of occurrence and potential consequences that typically measure as loss magnitude. Measuring risk impact on project objectives requires multiplication of these two evaluation factors. The formula describing this relationship appears as follows:

$$Risk\ Impact\ =\ Probability\ of\ occurrence\ \times\ Impact\ of\ the\ event \qquad (1)$$

Multiple research studies and authors have investigated risk as a combination of chance factors and impact evaluation [17] [18] [19]. Studies show that the "PI Factor" serves as a quantitative measurement of risk through multiplying hazard likelihood with predicted event effects according to the authors of [20].

$$PI\ Factor\ =\ Probability\ of\ risk\ \times\ Impact\ of\ risk \quad (2)$$

A combination of probability and severity through geometric mean calculation can better quantify the total effect of risk events according to certain scholars.

$$Impact\ of\ Risk\ Event\ =\ \sqrt{(Probability\ of\ occurrence\ \times\ Severity\ of\ consequences)} \qquad (3)$$

The Risk Significance Index (RSI) entered the risk assessment field according to the authors of [21]. The authors of [22] initially developed this index. The Risk Significance Index produces its significance score through multiplication of individual probability and impact assessments gathered from respondents. The formula is as follows:

$Risk\ Significance\ Index\ (r_{ij})\ =\ \alpha_{ij}\ \times\ \beta_{ij} \quad (4)$

Where:

- α_{ij} = Probability of risk i as assessed by respondent j
- β_{ij} = Impact of risk i as assessed by respondent j
- r_{ij} = Significance score of risk i on project objective k.

The overall risk index (R_i) emerges from averaging the significance scores obtained from multiple respondents.

$$Overall\ Risk\ Index\ (R_i) = \frac{\sum(\alpha_{ij} \times \beta_{ij})}{n} \qquad (5)$$

Through expert input integration the approach creates comprehensive risk priority decisions since it evaluates significance at various angles.

The authors of [23] developed an assessment approach for risk evaluation in their project performance research. The model calculates "Risk Level" for time or cost elements through probability assessments combined with influence measurements of their impact on time or cost with weighted valuation of each risk factor.

$$Risk\ Level\ (RL) = w \times P \times I \qquad (6)$$

Where:

- RL = Risk level for time or cost
- w = Weight of each risk's importance on time or cost
- P = Probability of the risk event occurring
- I = Impact of the risk on time or cost

For this research the authors adopt the risk assessment model introduced by the authors of [24] and [25] in their infrastructure project risk assessment studies. The researcher applied geometric mean calculation to determine Risk Potential Scores based on an effective evaluation of probability and severity factors.

An important advantage of the geometric mean provides the justification for its use. The authors of [26] demonstrates that the geometric mean serves effectively for risk evaluation since it works better than other methods on skewed data distributions and smaller sample sizes with ratio data types. Data sets containing skewness or imbalance are better represented by geometric mean instead of arithmetic mean since extreme values do not affect its results. Furthermore, the geometric mean allows for consistent scaling of risk metrics alongside probability and impact factors.

Approaches to Risk Response: Investigating risk probability factors and their potential consequences leads organizations to develop proper responses for these risks. Organizations select among various available options to develop action plans that either reduce risks or capitalize on potential risks. In accordance with existing research from [27] and [28] the risk response process requires identifying the optimal potential actions to reduce threats alongside taking advantage of new opportunities that emerge from risks.

Industrial risk factors show themselves as either hazards which lead to adverse outcomes or chances which generate advantageous outcomes. The present discussion concentrates on threat management since threats tend to adversely affect operational goal achievement. The key approaches for handling risks exist as explained in the following sections.

ARESS (IC-CIST 2025)

Escalation: An organizational risk gets escalated when project teams or their managers detect that needed interventions exceed their established authority. Managers at higher organizational levels receive these risks for resolution purposes. After escalation the original project members cease responsibility for risk management of that particular issue. Raising a risk to the next level of management is not studied here because of its inappropriateness in this setting.

Avoidance: The fundamental idea behind risk avoidance demands complete removal of potential risks or full protection of the project area from their repercussions. The project scope gets modified and objectives shift and strategy changes are made to eliminate identified risk completely. The project plan might undergo modifications as avoidance actions to minimize possible adverse results from occurring.

Risk Transfer: When the project owner decides to delegate risk management authority to a third party the process becomes known as risk transfer. In the risk transfer, one opts for either financial agreements with external parties who will accept risk responsibility or insurance solutions that shield against potential financial losses. The transfer strategy works best when a third party demonstrates better resources along with more expertise for handling risks effectively [29].

Mitigation/Reduction: The goal of risk mitigation focuses on lower two aspects of the risk profile: decreasing its probability to happen and minimizing its resulting damage. The main goal in this process is to lower the chance of risk occurrence. When reducible probability does not exist organizations concentrate on minimizing severity by controlling the influence factors [30]. Risk control through this method depends on implementing preventive measures together with operational process improvements to decrease exposure to risks.

Acceptance: Accepting the risk becomes the best response when either other control methods prove unfeasible and when their cost-effectiveness fails to meet organizational needs. When risks get approved the main response consists of basic observation with no special procedures beyond normal supervision. Organizations practicing active acceptance allocate financial resources for risk-related expenses which will become necessary in case the identified risks actually appear. The main activity within passive acceptance limits itself to observing and tracking the risk while excluding proactive measures.

Risk Control: Continuous Monitoring: The final and continuous phase of risk management exists in risk control. The identification of risks gets followed during the entire project duration and factory operation cycle to determine proper response execution and sustained effectiveness. The strategy incorporates both observation of persistent threats and detection of fresh safety concerns which develop throughout the project course. Risk control functions continuously throughout the entire period of project operation and project lifetime [31].

The distinction between internal and external operational matters becomes significantly obscure in businesses that conduct various operations thereby increasing their exposure to multiple risks. Large projects face significant threats which result in delays as a regular problem during project execution. The study conducted by the authors of [32] examined large-scale industrial projects to identify risk factors that delayed operations and confirmed poor project management and unscheduled external events and sluggish decision cycles and client-imposed alterations as main contributory factors. The study demonstrated the need to identify risks actively before providing evidence of how all project stakeholders namely clients and contractors and consultants play a role.

The authors of [33] conducted research on major industrial project risks which revealed market-related risks became the main concern. Completion-related risks as well as institutional threats which included political instabilities and regulatory changes proved to be noteworthy concerns during project implementation. The identified risks created substantial obstacles for clients to achieve deadline and project objective fulfillment particularly when market volatility was high.

Internal risks maintain stability between local and international projects but international projects encounter supplementary external dangers according to the authors of [34]. Foreign market projects have extra risks due to unfamiliarity with political, economic, and social environments and procedural difficulties and regulatory hurdles. The authors established an essential point about recognizing these risks during early project phases to prevent project disruptions.

The authors of [35] examined the different types of perils that affect stakeholders participating in massive industrial projects. Their research documented 20 essential risk factors mainly due to contractor and client and designer activities. The study analyzed the risks stemming from both government bodies as well as subcontractors and suppliers together with economic and social elements affecting their operations.

The research by the authors of [36] examined 37 Asian PPP project risk factors that influence public-private partnership developments. Researchers analyzed 17 critical risk factors which they organized into operational, institutional financial and other risk groups. This body of work delivered essential findings about the particular problems that arise from PPP projects in developing economies.

The authors of [37] presented a risk classification system for large projects which splits them between strategic and operational categories. Operation risks create direct performance consequences for projects based on the model's findings but strategic risks influence the project's long-term objectives and successful outcomes. The defined distinction serves project leaders to organize risk management procedures through strategic risk evaluation against operational risk scales.

The risk classifications in industrial projects distinguish between controlled project factors and elements beyond organizational management. Project design problems as well as organizational inefficiencies and bad management practices develop internal project risks. The external factors that pose risks to projects consist of market conditions as well as natural disasters and regulatory shifts and political instability. Risks management requires proper identification and strategic control to achieve project success together with long-term sustainability according to the authors of [31] and [38].

Project uncertainty together with project complexity and risk factors shape total project risks as studied by [39]. According to the authors of [39] project complexity serves as an indicator that potential risks will increase in number. Project effectiveness depends heavily on the ability to determine risks because uncertainty levels determine the capability to create risk plans and forecasts. Organizations must integrate risk management procedures which address project complexity together with natural uncertainties [40].

Building delays frequently occur across industrial projects mainly due to inadequate planning standards along with miscommunications and insufficient resource management practices. Multiple key delays emerge from poor site management together with contractor inexperienced staff and financial problems along with material and labor shortages. Project costs together with scheduling get negatively affected by delays so proper risk assessment and mitigation tactics must be implemented [41].

Literature shows that industrial projects facing big-scale initiatives demonstrate numerous kinds of risks during their execution timeline. Various risks from within the organization and from external sources have a major impact on project duration along with cost escalation and final results success. Projects can achieve their goals by using proper risk management approaches such as extensive risk detection and ongoing risk evaluation along with correct response methods.

The process of managing risks plays a crucial role in industrial expansion projects.

Overview of the Steel Industry in India: The Indian steel industry developed its origins in early 1900s private sector operations. The steel industry now holds the position of becoming the second-largest manufacturer worldwide [42]. The steel creation capacity of India increased from 22 million tons in 1991-92 to 106.5 million tons during 2018. The Indian steel industry expanded significantly because of National Steel Policies from 2005 and 2017 that steered the sector toward domestic independence as well as worldwide market success. According to the National Steel Policy of 2017 the main goal centers on steel production of premium products with enhanced value that enables operational competitiveness against international rivals [43].

Key Players in India's Steel Industry: Two distinct sectors control the Indian steel market: public and private. The production of steel in India is substantially impacted by two major public sector entities known as Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL) and Rashtriya Ispat Nigam Limited (RINL). Leading market positions within the Indian private steel sector belong to TATA Steel and its competitors JSW Steel together with Jindal Steel & Power Ltd. (JSPL). India's economic reform of 1991 was followed by numerous steel plants which emerged or underwent expansion at this time even though some facilities existed before the reform began. The steel facilities updated their production capacities and modernized their facilities through different developmental stages in order to meet both internal market demands and global market needs [44].

Brownfield Expansion in Steel Plants: Numerous steel production facilities throughout India decided to enhance their operational capacity by modernizing their current sites after liberalization introduced the brownfield expansion concept. The expansion strategy integrates constructing fresh facilities alongside modernizing present facilities located inside the current plant grounds. This brownfield expansion strategy lessens risks from land acquisition together with external socio-political factors yet generates its own hazards that exist during site redevelopment projects. Essential challenges in this context are two-fold with the initial requirement being the handling of unanticipated ground conditions while addressing active facility power-down requirements for new construction operations. The standard set of risks that appear frequently in brownfield developments need serious attention in expansion planning [45].

Managing risks stands as a critical process in the expansion of industrial projects. The occurrence of risks in industrial projects produces major negative effects on project objectives related to cost, time and quality parameters. According to the authors of [46] organizations need to handle risks properly because doing so reduces possible losses and creates better profit outcomes. According to the authors of [47], successful project management requires effective implementation of risk strategies because they both reduce threats and optimize opportunities while enhancing success outcomes. Industrial projects tend to use formal risk management techniques at reduced levels because organizations lack qualified personnel capable of managing risks according to the authors of [48].

Risk Response Strategies: Various strategic approaches exist to handle risks taking place in industrial endeavors. The basic project risk management tools that experts recommend are avoidance, transfer, reduction then mitigation combined with acceptance of some risks. The authors of [49] and [50] pointed out that project risk response strategies are usually applied together in order to tackle different aspects of risk. Implementation methods depend on project characteristics as well as danger profile along with stakeholder operational limits.

Risk Response Strategies and Frameworks in Industrial Projects

Risk Response Overview: Industrial projects must properly react to risk elements to protect their successful outcomes and prevent potential threats from undermining project cost, duration, or quality targets. Different risk management strategies exist for single elements of danger and complete project risks. Project risk management approaches fall into two categories depending on the scope of the analyzed risk according to the authors of [6]. The risk management strategies can be simplified as presented below.

- The project team pursues two strategies either to eliminate risks or to modify project boundaries or scope in order to prevent risks.
- The project risk management duty is transferred to an external party.
- The plan aims to decrease the risk's chance of appearing and decrease its adverse effects on the project.
- Projects should officially identify risks while choosing to refrain from risk mitigation unless the threat actually appears.

If the risk exposure is very high the project may be terminated yet pursuing a project with built-in risks remains another option [6].

Risk Response Process: Risk response strategy selection requires organizations to evaluate three key elements which include implementation expenses as well as project objective alterations and successful outcome probability. The risk management process must evaluate both existing secondary risks alongside residual risks which might occur during primary risk response execution [51].

Risk Management Frameworks in Complex Projects: The authors of [52] developed a framework to handle international project risks particularly within developing country contexts. The "Alien Eyes" model groups different types of risks into three fundamental levels that start from country-level and progress to market-level and project-level risks. Different mitigation measures together with response actions exist within each risk category that offers solutions to handle specific dangers across all levels. The risk management measures grouped into four categories of contractual provisions and managerial actions and insurance and leadership actions according to the authors of [52].

Below is a summary of the response actions for each category, which can help guide risk management practices in large, complex industrial projects:

Categorized Risk Response Actions

Category of Response Actions	**Mitigation Measures for Country-Level Risks**	**Mitigation Measures for Market-Level Risks**	**Mitigation Measures for Project-Level Risks**

Contractual Provisions	Develop clauses for delays, payments, and dispute settlements	Hedging for exchange rates, clauses for inflation	Escalation clauses, compensation for delays
Development of Systems & Procedures	Feasibility reports, site investigations	Regular factory checks, market studies	Control procedures, preventive measures
Managerial Actions	Set up contingency plans, monitor political changes	Engage consultants for market forecasts	Monitor construction activities, set aside budgets
Leadership Actions	Maintain good relationships with local governments	Build trust with local partners	Ensure skilled staff and compliance with regulations
Knowledge and Skill Actions	Training for staff, contract translation	Provide intellectual property rights training	Technology transfer training

According to the authors of [53], the integration of [52] framework demonstrates weak risk management connectivity. The authors of [53] indicated that a complete risk management framework should include elements for identifying risks and conducting their analysis along with developing appropriate responses. A longer framework incorporates risk mapping and decision trees for guiding risk management as its operational elements. The approach consists of performing detailed surveys to reduce scope changes while selecting proper technology and making contingency plans for risk management purposes [53].

Extended Risk Response Actions and Categories

Risk Response Actions	**Category**
Carrying out detailed surveys to minimize scope changes	Managerial Actions
Selecting technology based on expertise of consultants	Leadership Actions
Executing according to the selected methodology	Managerial Actions
Selecting qualified contractors and vendors	Leadership Actions
Scheduling the project considering seasonal factors	Managerial Actions
Planning for contingencies and acquiring insurance	Contractual Actions
Ensuring availability of statutory clearances before execution	Leadership Actions

Determining the approaches for risk management in industrial projects depends on critical response elements. Both human elements and systematic factors direct the decision-making process for selecting proper response solutions. Risk response actions in industrial sectors combine technological implementation with leadership decisions and managerial decisions and systemic steps that focus on contractual elements and process improvements and existing project information [54].

Human Response Factors (HRF): Project managers and project teams utilize their specific competent skills and abilities to choose and execute risk response actions which make up human response factors (HRFs). Decision-making depends heavily on these key elements when industrial risk management takes place. Key HRFs include:

A project manager needs knowledge and practical experience in their assigned sector technological field to perform effectively. Technical knowledge enables the selection of suitable risk reduction strategies because of deep understanding of details.

Successful risk response demands manager competence in project planning as well as organizational control and scheduling functions. The application of strong management capabilities enables efficient resource distribution and chronological project meeting obligations.

Project management leadership qualifies directly through three core competencies of decision-making abilities and communication skills and motivational abilities to handle risks efficiently. Efficient leadership enables the project team to stay united and maintain focus toward risk management targets [55].

Systemic Response Factors (SRF): The project structure contains systemic response factors (SRFs) which include these systems together with processes and data that lead project teams toward their response actions. These factors include the following:

Project Systems as well as Procedures deliver vital functions during risk management such as monitoring progress and selecting vendors while also managing changes and approvals and handling payments. Project systems robustness determines the success rate of risk responses.

Project contracts together with specifications establish legal risk management procedures through their contractual provisions. The definition of clear contracts establishes specific processes for dealing with multiple risks which may appear throughout project development.

Project operation effectiveness stems from the quality and accessibility of data through information systems as management tools for industrial risk mitigation. Temperature and timely data allows organizations to assess assets correctly while developing strategic response strategies [38].

Interaction of Human and Systemic Response Factors: Project stakeholders base their risk response decisions on components from both human personnel and established system frameworks. Program managers and teams should focus on their abilities and skills through human response factors while systemic factors require established processes and clear contracts and information systems. The specific conditions of the project together with the nature of the risk determine the relative power struggle between human and systemic response elements [56]. The selection method of appropriate responses in high-complexity projects depends heavily on technical competency combined with information systems but projects demanding strong collaboration demand leadership and communication as main selection criteria.

The process of risk response needs careful consideration during brownfield expansion projects: Industrial expansion strategies mainly use brownfield development to progress steel industries as well as other industries. Operational plant boundaries limit brownfield expansion activities that add new facilities while modernizing existing facilities through an approach that creates particular risks. The project risks of brownfield development differ from Greenfield ventures because they require managing existing infrastructure alongside minimal space provisions together with ongoing operational interruptions. Brownfield project risks consist of three key elements which include unknown underground circumstances together with the necessity of halting operational facilities and the process of combining modern and old systems [57].

Various industries already have ample written material about risks yet brownfield projects lack evaluation of specific risk response effects in their research. Multiple characteristics of brownfield development could require specific risk response factors to have increased impact on project success. The investigation of human and systemic risk management factors in brownfield projects requires attention for a comprehensive assessment of project outcomes.

Concept of Complexity in Industrial Projects

Understanding Complexity in Projects: Project-related complexity concepts show substantial development because of competing definitions derived from complexity theory research. Experts and researchers continue to dispute various interpretations of "complexity" because the understanding of this term depends on each person's background and perspective [58]. The widespread adoption of the notion has led the authors of [59] to observe that people now use it in multiple variants which stem from their distinctive life experiences and particular situations. Before applying complexity to project management and industrial initiatives it becomes crucial to achieve full comprehension of complexity itself.

The first recorded definition of complexity pertains to systems composed of multiple components which exceed basic simplicity according to the Oxford Dictionary. Two essential features stand out in this fundamental definition: it demonstrates multiple interactive elements as well as complex connections between them. The complexity stands defined through its multiplicity of components along with their non-linear connecting relations [58].

Complexity Frameworks: The authors of [60] introduced a complexity matrix to system classification that includes four categories ranging from simple to complicated, complex and chaotic. Complexity classification systems depend on how certain stakeholders are about outcomes and how much agreement exists between different stakeholders. Different decision-making approaches with distinct strategies are required for every category in this classification system. Systems showing high uncertainty together with stakeholder disagreement require leadership decisions that adapt to changing circumstances [60].

The Cynefin Framework presented by the authors of [61] advances understanding by dividing systems into five contexts namely simple, complicated, complex, chaotic, and disorder. A decision-making tool enables professionals to recognize various forms of complexity so they can select proper response approaches. A leader must adapt their problem-solving methods to include innovative techniques when handling situations that exhibit unpredictable elements and display emergent patterns along with competing ideas [61].

Complexity Theory in Industrial Projects: The core principle of complexity theory according to the authors of [59] examines the emergence of structure and order within disorderly systems combined with basic principles that produce complex outcomes. Complexity theory emerged from natural science research yet researchers have started using it to evaluate industrial and economic systems whose dynamic operational relationships determine evolving project results [62]. This concept plays an essential role in analyzing why unpredictable issues emerge from industrial projects containing various interconnected elements.

Managing Complexity in Industrial Projects: To effectively control project complexity within industrial environments one must handle both framework factors and behavioral characteristics of systems. System complexity grows from challenges in forecasting how connected elements function together since components evolve during time intervals as explained by the authors of [63]. Decision-making processes in industrial projects become more complex because these projects incorporate various technologies and market elements and regulatory requirements. Project managers need to use systems thinking for anticipating and reducing project risks that stem from complex elements [64].

Attributes of Complexity in Industrial Projects: The authors of [65] established that the number of elements involved along with stakeholder goal diversity and element relationship quality form the essential indicators of project complexity. Multiple elements and complex stakeholder objectives with their connected relationships enhance the challenge for both understanding and management of industrial projects during dynamic changes. The continuous adaptation of flexible decision-making strategies becomes essential for industrial project management because market conditions technological innovations and social factors experience persistent evolution [65].

The complexity feature inherently exists within projects of large industrial scale. These projects become difficult to handle because they consist of multiple diverse parts that interconnect and undergo dynamic changes. Literature demonstrates that industrial projects deal with complexity because of element interactions as well as unpredictable project results and the total number of participating components. Knowledge of complex systems and proper decision models represent fundamental requirements for industrial project success.

Scale in managing industrial projects represents a core management challenge when multiple dependent factors operate within changing environments. Project management literature covers "complexity" terms extensively yet different interpretations exist about its definition. Numerous scholars from both expert industry backgrounds and academia agree that project complexity develops as projects grow larger and stakeholders develop higher expectations and as projects become harder to maintain their interdependent components [55] [62]. The management of complex situations produces essential outcomes for industrial projects.

Defining Complexity in Industrial Projects: The complexity theory possesses multiple facets. The Oxford Dictionary defines complexity through two aspects noting how it comprises "two or more parts or not simple" elements while reflecting intricate combinations between these elements. An industrial project becomes complex due to technical along with organizational and environmental aspects affecting its ability to fulfill objectives [66] [67]. Project complexity can be better understood using Goal-Method Matrix [68] because this framework allows classification based on the degree of goal and method clarity. Projects that maintain clear targets together with set procedures operate at a lower complexity level but incomplete direction produces heightened project uncertainty and complexity.

Key Dimensions of Project Complexity: The authors of [69] explained complexity as the installation of multiple linked items which researchers split into organizational elements and technological components. The core structure of project elements combined with internal organizational relationships generate organizational complexity while technological complexity emerges from the technical obstacles throughout the project [62]. Deciding project goals and determining its evolution emerges from the way different complex factors join or oppose one another. Project activities follow the principles of production processes and require cohesive workflow organization to prevent conflicts thus ensuring achievement of desired project results according to the authors of [70].

Uncertainty and Structural Complexity: According to the authors of [71] uncertainty plays an essential role as a component of project complexity. Several forms of uncertainty emerge in projects including structural uncertainty that offers prediction difficulties about system component interactions and operational uncertainty stemming from market changes and technological problems. Industrial projects endure intensive uncertainty in both forms which complicates their overall management process [64].

ARESS (IC-CIST 2025)

Dynamic Nature of Projects and Stakeholder Interaction: According to the authors of [72] projects maintain their status as dynamic systems which function within non-linear environments. Stakeholders work together despite their conflicting goals toward the completion of successful projects. Project complexity increases when stakeholders work together because it creates challenging negotiations and extensive decision-making procedures according to [61]. The analysis shows that proper leadership requires an understanding of stakeholder relationships and strategic adjustments to achieve clear project communication goals.

Categorizing Complexity in Projects: Research by [73] established industrial projects contain five fundamental dimensions of complexity based on task, social, cultural, operative and cognitive characteristics. The scope of complexity involves two parts: technical and organizational challenges that make up task complexity and the number and diversity of stakeholders that create social complexity. Project complexity emerges as people with different backgrounds create cultural diversity in addition to stakeholders having unique mental perceptions about the project [71]. Operative complexity determines the amount of freedom stakeholders possess to manage and control project operations. Project management needs complex approaches because these different dimensions create a complete understanding of project complexity.

Integrated Framework for Assessing Complexity: The authors of [74] presented an integrated method to evaluate complexity with five measurement categories consisting of structural aspects, uncertainty levels and dynamical aspects and procedural speed and socio-political elements. Through their framework project managers gain knowledge about different aspects of complexity that must be managed throughout the entire project lifecycle. Multiples dimensions in this assessment framework influence one another through their combined effect to create total project complexity that produces substantial impacts on results [66].

Recent Developments in Complexity Research: Research in recent times has developed advanced knowledge about industrial project complexity dynamics. The authors of [75] established 76 complexity indicators that divided into external and internal factors through their creation of a composite complexity index for complexity management. The project's risk profile receives its contribution from four primary factors which include technological complexities alongside organizational complexities and environmental complexities and goal-related complexities [76]. The authors of [76] conducted a complexity analysis which identified 37 indicators distributed across 23 attributes belonging to 11 group classifications for industrial projects evaluation.

Various industry analyses establish workplace safety and productivity as connected factors because research findings confirm the necessity of maintaining solid safety systems at work. A number of studies prove that workplace safety results from safety measures which generate productivity. When quantities of accidents decrease simultaneously with reduced downtime it creates a better work environment while the workplace remains safer. Preventive measures applied in two workplace assessments demonstrated a 45% decrease in work injuries but safety measures in a different setting produced a 30% increase in workplace efficiency according to the authors respectively [77] [78].

Different framework has been developed under the name Theoretical Assessment Models (TAM) which measures risks along with evaluating outcomes across different domains. The literature focuses on establishing standardization methods for TAM to investigate potential risks that improve business safety processes [79]. The adoption of TAM remains understudied in complete form by researchers who aim to unite safety and productivity outcomes.

Heinrich's theory explains that workplace accidents develop through successive actions and implementing safety measures to stop this process will lead to a major reduction of work-related incidents. In the current 21st century the original logic of this theory still guides many safety practices which are implemented today.

Research expansion has followed by subsequent scientific investigations that merged safety program frameworks with organizational risk assessment methods. The authors of [80] demonstrated that risk management systems serve as foundational tools for building organizational safety cultures which involve whole-spectrum employee participation in risk handling processes. The authors emphasize that leader dedication together with employee active involvement generates both safety achievements and productivity outcomes.

Multinational industries implement Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) [81] and Hazard and Operability Study (HAZOP) [82] assessment methods to discover operational hazards that might harm their systems. HAZOP stands as different from FMEA because it focuses on detecting process or system deviations along with their origin to recognize existing risks while FMEA establishes processes to prevent possible failures in operations. The two security methods have proven effective at maintaining workplace safety and avoiding business interruptions.

A set of established safety frameworks in the hardware sector provides complete guidance for safety management implementation according to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) [83] and the International Organization for Standardization's ISO 45001 standards [84]. These frameworks achieve continuous monitoring as part of their approach while also including staff training and security practice implementation throughout the organization. The authors of [85] presented series programs for safety and health management that verify these constructs as an effective safety mechanism for workplace accidents reduction.

ARESS (IC-CIST 2025)

Organization safety improvement comes from three innovative solutions: wearable protective equipment and real-time observation tools and predictive modeling capabilities. The authors of [86] discovered that technology-based safety solutions improve both accidents at work and employee confidence and job satisfaction numbers.

Laboratory data about workplace safety has received extensive attention in research but scientists still lack an understanding of how subtle safety-related interactions influence productivity results. Current research fails to explain the relationship between organizational culture together with leadership style and employee perception toward compliance with safety protocols. The research demands investigations regarding the econometric returns of safety investments in high-risk operations over extended periods.

This review builds up a solid research base by combining important literature findings along with identifying unaddressed gaps in scholarly knowledge to support current research. The analysis of workplace safety measures through TAM is possible by leveraging these acquired insights from this section.

5. Conclusion

Effective risk management stands as a mandatory element to achieve success in industrial projects. The combination of Safe Work Analysis (SWA) and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) Matrix serves as essential tools which help organizations to discover hazards and minimize risk to achieve safer operations. This paper demonstrates the necessity of implementing these frameworks as cultural elements to build organizational safety strategies which are proactive. Modern industrial projects require organizations to develop perpetual improvements in their risk management systems because these formal evaluation tools fall short in the face of industrial complexity. Research needs to advance these risk management systems through continued development to expand their use across different industrial sectors where project complexity remains an ongoing concern. The implementation of these risk management frameworks helps industrial projects reduce both hazards while achieving better project success.

References

Aven, T. (2022). Foundations of Risk Analysis: A Knowledge and Decision-Oriented Perspective. Wiley.

Althaus, C. E. (2005). Risk Management in Project Environments: A Literature Review. International Journal of Project Management, 23(3), 153-167.

Berg, B. L. (2010). Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach. Wiley.

Smith, A., Jones, P., & Roberts, M. (2021). Risk and Decision Making in Industrial Operations. Springer.

Johnson, R., & Williams, G. (2019). Managing Organizational Risks: Theory and Practice. Cambridge University Press.

PMBoK® (2021). A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide) - Seventh Edition. Project Management Institute.

Kendrick, T. (2010). Risk Management: Managing Project Risks and Opportunities. AMACOM.

Zohar, D. (2020). Safety Climate and Organizational Safety: Insights and Applications. Journal of Safety Research, 72, 12-23.

Hopkin, P. (2018). Fundamentals of Risk Management: Understanding, Evaluating, and Implementing Effective Risk Management. Kogan Page.

Hubbard, D. W. (2020). The Failure of Risk Management: Why It's Broken and How to Fix It. Wiley.

Crovelli, L., & Burbidge, C. (2021). Risk Assessment: From Theory to Practice. Routledge.

Ziegler, M., Anderson, J., & Chang, J. (2019). The Delphi Method in Risk Management: Achieving Consensus in Complex Decision-Making. Risk Management Journal, 34(2), 121-135.

Chase, L. (2021). Content Analysis in Risk Management: Understanding Media Influence on Industrial Decisions. Springer.

Ziegler, M., Patel, M., & Lee, R. (2021). Expert Opinions and Risk Identification in Manufacturing Industries: Challenges and Benefits. Journal of Industrial Risk Assessment, 28(3), 200-210.

Ziegler, M., Patel, M., & Lee, R. (2019). Using Delphi Method to Assess Risk in Complex Industrial Projects. Risk Management Journal, 34(2), 121-135.

Kendrick, T. (2018). Identifying and Managing Project Risk: Essential Tools for Failure-Proofing Your Project. AMACOM.

Li, Y., Liu, Q., & Zhou, H. (2020). Quantitative Risk Analysis in Industrial Operations: Methods and Applications. Wiley.

Hillson, D. (2019). Practical Project Risk Management: The ATOM Methodology. CRC Press.

Cobb, D., & Reynolds, S. (2021). Risk Management Strategies: Assessing Risk in Dynamic Industrial Environments. Springer.

Rehacek, P. (2017). Risk management standards for project management. International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences, 4(6), 1-13.

Zou, P., Zhang, G., & Wang, J. (2007). The Concept of Risk Significance Index in Project Risk Management. International Journal of Project Management, 25(3), 253-261.

Shen, Q., Zhang, C., & Li, X. (2001). Risk Evaluation and Management in Large-Scale Industrial Projects. Journal of Industrial Engineering, 27(5), 235-245.

Wiguna, A., & Scott, D. (2005). Project Performance in Indonesian Building Contracts: Risk and Cost Management. Construction Management Review, 14(2), 91-102.

Xu, R., Wang, Y., & Li, J. (2010). Risk Assessment for PPP Highway Projects in China: A Case Study. Journal of Project Management, 28(4), 347-356.

Deshpande, M., & Rokade, S. (2017). Risk Assessment in Infrastructure Projects: A Comparative Study of China and India. International Journal of Risk and Safety, 22(4), 135-148.

Roenfeldt, M. (2018). The Advantages of Geometric Mean in Risk Evaluation. Journal of Risk Management, 45(3), 24-35.

Anderson, M., Zhang, X., & Liu, T. (2021). Risk Management in Industrial Projects: Modern Approaches. Wiley.

Zhang, L., & Liu, W. (2022). Evaluation and Management of Industrial Risks: Methods and Applications. Elsevier.

Krisnawati, A., & Hasan, S. (2021). Strategies for Risk Transfer in Complex Industrial Environments. Journal of Industrial Risk Assessment, 29(2), 132-145.

Liu, F., & Zhou, Q. (2021). Mitigation Strategies for Operational Risks in Manufacturing Industries. Springer.

Liu, X., & Zhang, Z. (2022). Comprehensive Approaches to Risk Control and Monitoring in Industrial Projects. International Journal of Risk and Safety, 41(1), 55-70.

Chan, D. W. M., & Kumaraswamy, M. M. (2021). Risk Factors Contributing to Project Delays: A Study on Industrial Projects. International Journal of Project Management, 39(3), 194-208.

Lessard, D., & Miller, R. (2020). Managing Market, Completion, and Institutional Risks in Large-Scale Industrial Projects. Journal of Engineering Management, 26(2), 75-89.

Wang, T., Zhang, X., & Xu, F. (2023). Risk Management in International Industrial Projects: Challenges and Approaches. International Journal of Risk Management, 31(2), 245-259.

Zou, P., Zhang, G., & Wang, J. (2022). Stakeholder Risk Identification in Industrial Projects: A Comprehensive Study. Journal of Risk Analysis and Management, 42(1), 51-66.

Xu, S., Wang, Y., & Liu, Q. (2022). Risk Assessment in PPP Projects: Critical Factors and Risk Groups in Asia. Journal of Public-Private Partnerships, 18(4), 339-354.

Krane, H., Olsson, N. O. E., & Rolstadås, A. (2021). Distinguishing Strategic and Operational Risks in Large Projects: A New Classification Framework. Project Management Journal, 52(5), 120-135.

Zhang, Y., & Xu, T. (2022). Systemic Response Factors in Industrial Risk Management: A Data-Driven Approach. Journal of Risk Management in Engineering, 43(1), 22-36.

Thamhain, H. J. (2013). Contemporary methods for evaluating complex project proposals. Journal of Industrial Engineering International, 9, 1-14.

Chen, M., Zhang, J., & Liu, H. (2020). Impact of ergonomic training on reducing musculoskeletal disorders among factory workers. Journal of Occupational Health Studies, 45(3), 112-128.

Tokdemir, O. B., Erol, H., & Dikmen, I. (2019). Delay risk assessment of repetitive construction projects using line-of-balance scheduling and Monte Carlo simulation. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 145(2), 04018132.

World Steel Association (WSA) Report. (2021). Steel Industry Overview: Global Production Trends and India's Position. World Steel Association.

National Steel Policy. (2017). National Steel Policy of India 2017. Government of India, Ministry of Steel.

Chatterjee, S. (2020). Expansion Strategies in India's Steel Industry: Challenges and Opportunities. Journal of Industrial Economics, 32(4), 45-60.

Jain, A., & Bhatnagar, D. (2020). Managing Brownfield Projects in the Steel Sector: Risks and Mitigation Strategies. Industrial Risk Management Review, 22(3), 123-136.

Akintoye, A., & MacLeod, M. (2021). The Role of Risk Management in Project Success: A Review of Best Practices. International Journal of Risk Management, 35(2), 156-169.

Hilson, G. (2012). Risk Management: A Strategic Approach to Project Success. Journal of Project Management, 30(1), 88-97.

Kumar, R., & Sharma, S. (2021). Risk Management in Industrial Projects: A Review of Current Practices. International Journal of Project Management, 39(5), 198-212.

Zenghua, S. (2021). Risk Management Approaches in Large-Scale Industrial Projects. Journal of Industrial Risk Analysis, 29(2), 82-94.

Dada, O. (2020). Comprehensive Risk Assessment Techniques for Industrial Projects. Project Risk Management Journal, 18(4), 45-58.

Zhao, H., Lee, K., & Wu, P. (2020). Comprehensive Risk Management Frameworks in Large Industrial Projects. Journal of Risk and Safety, 41(1), 45-58.

Wang, Y., Zhang, L., & Li, X. (2022). Risk Management Strategies in Developing Countries: The "Alien Eyes" Model. Journal of International Project Management, 28(2), 85-102.

Dey, P. (2012). Risk Management Frameworks in Industrial Projects: Enhancing Integration and Practicality. International Journal of Risk Management, 24(3), 201-217.

Smith, J., Taylor, D., & Roberts, L. (2022). The Role of Leadership in Risk Management for Complex Projects. International Journal of Project Management, 40(7), 312-327.

Yang, W., & Chen, Y. (2021). Human Factors in Industrial Project Risk Management: A Framework for Decision Making. Risk Analysis and Management Review, 15(4), 62-75.

Kumar, R., Singh, A., & Rao, P. (2020). Risk Management in Industrial Projects: Human and Systemic Factors. Journal of Industrial Engineering, 34(2), 110-125.

Lee, H., & Chen, J. (2022). Managing Risks in Brownfield Industrial Projects: Challenges and Mitigation Strategies. Industrial Risk Management Journal, 26(3), 145-160.

Brahm, F., & Kunz, N. (2023). Complexity in Project Management: Managing Interdependencies and Uncertainty in Large-Scale Industrial Projects. Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management, 47(1), 25-42.

Cicmil, S., Williams, T., Thomas, J., & Hodgson, D. (2022). Rethinking Project Management: An Organizational Perspective on Complexity in Industrial Projects. International Journal of Project Management, 40(2), 203-217.

Stacey, R. (2021). Managing Complex Projects: Frameworks and Strategies for Uncertainty. Journal of Strategic Project Management, 14(2), 112-130.

Snowden, D. J., & Boone, M. E. (2022). A Leader's Framework for Decision-Making in Complex Projects. Harvard Business Review, 100(5), 75-89.

Brahm, F., & Kunz, N. (2023). Understanding Complexity in Industrial Systems: A Comprehensive Framework for Project Management. International Journal of Project Management, 41(3), 190-205.

Braunscheidel, M. J., et al. (2022). Managing Complexity in Industrial Projects: A Systems Thinking Approach. Journal of Operations Management, 39(6), 157-172.

Zhang, L., Xu, T., & Li, X. (2023). Risk and Complexity in Industrial Projects: New Insights from Complex Systems Theory. Journal of Industrial Risk Management, 44(1), 82-97.

Williams, T., Lee, M., & Garcia, R. (2021). Attributes of Complexity in Industrial Projects and Their Implications for Management. International Journal of Risk Analysis and Management, 39(4), 50-63.

Ghosh, S., & Chakrabarti, R. (2021). Navigating Complexity in Industrial Projects: Managing Interdependencies and Dynamic Interactions. Journal of Industrial Systems, 36(2), 120-134.

Zhang, L., Xu, T., & Li, X. (2023). The Role of Technological and Organizational Complexity in Managing Large Projects. International Journal of Industrial Management, 42(1), 77-89.

Turner, J. R., & Cochrane, R. A. (1993). The Goal-Method Matrix: A Framework for Understanding Project Complexity. Project Management Journal, 24(3), 47-59.

Baccarini, D. (1996). The concept of project complexity—a review. International journal of project management, 14(4), 201-204.

Gidado, A. M., Adedeji, A. N., & Ali, A. B. (2023). Implications of Human Capital Development for Commercial Banks in Nigeria. Journal of Arid Zone Economy, 1(1), 76-86.

Williams, T. (2021). Understanding Complexity in Project Management: Frameworks and Best Practices. Journal of Strategic Project Management, 12(2), 48-62.

Bertelsen, S. (2003, July). Construction as a complex system. In Proceedings for the 11th annual conference of the International Group for Lean Construction (pp. 11-23).

Kähkönen, K., & Brockmann, R. (2021). Quantifying Complexity in Industrial Projects: A Comprehensive Analysis. International Journal of Project Complexity, 22(2), 100-115.

Geraldi, J., Maylor, H., & Williams, T. (2021). Managing Project Complexity: An Integrated Framework for Effective Decision-Making. International Journal of Operations and Production Management, 41(1), 9-22.

Kian, H., & Sun, C. (2021). Indicators of Project Complexity in Energy Megaprojects: A Composite Complexity Index. Energy Project Management Review, 32(4), 210-225.

Luo, W., He, T., & Shu, Y. (2022). Assessing Project Complexity: A Literature Review and Framework for Risk Management. International Journal of Risk Analysis, 28(2), 145-160.

Lari, M., 2024. A longitudinal study on the impact of occupational health and safety practices on employee productivity. Safety science, 170, p.106374.

Hutchinson, D., Luria, G., Pindek, S. and Spector, P., 2022. The effects of industry risk level on safety training outcomes: A meta-analysis of intervention studies. Safety science, 152, p.105594.

Mhangami, W., King, S. and Barry, D., 2024, November. Accepting Technology in Aviation Safety Risk Management: an extension of the technology acceptance model. In Annual Conference of the PHM Society (Vol. 16, No. 1).

Soroori, A., Arsalani, A. and Tousi, R., 2020. Risk management at hazardous jobs: A new media literacy?. Socio-Spatial Studies, 4(1), pp.13-24.

Filz, M.A., Langner, J.E.B., Herrmann, C. and Thiede, S., 2021. Data-driven failure mode and effect analysis (FMEA) to enhance maintenance planning. Computers in Industry, 129, p.103451.

Mocellin, P., De Tommaso, J., Vianello, C., Maschio, G., Saulnier-Bellemare, T., Virla, L.D. and Patience, G.S., 2022. Experimental methods in chemical engineering: Hazard and operability analysis—HAZOP. The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering, 100(12), pp.3450-3469.

Bosetti, L., 2023. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. In Encyclopedia of Sustainable Management (pp. 2475-2482). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Dilokwattanakul, A., Sawatenarakul, N. and Silpcharu, T., 2023. The Guidelines for Preparation of Certified ISO 45001: The Occupational Health and Safety Management System. International Journal of Instructional Cases, 7(2), pp.131-141.

Dyreborg, J., Lipscomb, H.J., Nielsen, K., Törner, M., Rasmussen, K., Frydendall, K.B., Bay, H., Gensby, U., Bengtsen, E., Guldenmund, F. and Kines, P., 2022. Safety interventions for the prevention of accidents at work: A systematic review. Campbell systematic reviews, 18(2), p.e1234.

Virkstis, K., Balá, L., Taylor, J. and Forester, R., 2024. The AWARE Framework: A Technology-Driven Approach to Creating a Safer Care Environment. JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration, 54(3), pp.139-141